

## **R E M A R K S**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-17, 20 and 21 will be in the application, with claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12 – 16, 20, and 21 having been amended, and claims 7, 11, and 17 - 19 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 14, 16, and 20 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 8, 14, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,516,421 (“Peters”). Claims 11, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,536 (“Park”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

### §112 Rejections

The §112 rejections have been addressed in accordance with the examiner’s helpful suggestions.

### §102/103 Rejections

Claims 1, 14, 16, and 20

Amended independent claim 1 discloses a method that comprises establishing a first power policy associated with a system that places the system in a low- power state after a first pre-determined period of time, receiving from a user an indication via a display unit that the user is no longer using the system, and in response to the indication, establishing a second power policy associated with the system that places the system in the low-power state after a second

pre-determined period of time. Moreover, the second pre-determined time is less than the first pre-determined time.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above mentioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest 1) receiving from a user an indication via a display unit that the user is no longer using a system and 2) in response to the indication, establishing a second power policy.

Peters, at column 3, lines 45 – 50, states that “The user may be prompted... or at some later time when the users task is deemed to be complete such as when the user indicates completion by selection log off or shut down.” Thus, Peters discloses an indication entered through a input device (i.e. attached to a processing unit) but does not disclose that the a display device can provide the indication.

Accordingly, nowhere can Peters be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an indication via a display unit that the user is no longer using a system.

Furthermore, Peters discloses that the user is only prompted when the user indicates completion by selecting log off or shut down but does not disclose settings are changed in response to the indication. Therefore, nowhere does Peters disclose establishing a second power policy in response to the indication.

The remaining art of record has been reviewed and is not seem to remedy the foregoing deficiencies in Peters. Therefore, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving from a user an indication via a display unit that the user is no longer using a system and in response to the indication, establishing a second power policy. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 14, 16, and 20 each disclose receiving from a user an indication via a display unit that the user is no longer using a system and in response to the indication, establishing a second power policy. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claims 14, 16, and 20 and their related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 5

Dependent claim 5 discloses the method of claim 1 where the indication comprises turning off the display unit.

At column 3, lines 34 – 38, Peters discloses prompting to increase an inactivity period “via a pop up window which includes input fields or scrollable lists of selectable values for ... when to switch off the display device”. Thus Peters discloses an indication as to when to turn off a display device and not an indication comprising turning off the display unit. In view of the foregoing, dependent claim 5 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

April 25, 2007  
Date

/RSF/  
Richard S. Finkelstein  
Registration No. 56,534  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
50 Locust Avenue  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-4982